



**SHREWSBURY PLANNING BOARD
SHREWSBURY, MASSACHUSETTS**

MINUTES

Regular Meeting: December 8, 2005 - 7:00 P.M.

Location: Selectmen's Hearing Room - Municipal Office Building

Present: Melvin P. Gordon, Chairman
Stephan M. Rodolakis, Vice-Chairman
Jill R. Myers Clerk
Kathleen M. Keohane
Donald F. Naber

Also Present: Eric Denoncourt, Engineer/Planner

Mr. Gordon opened the meeting at 7:00 P.M.

1. Approved Minutes of October 6, 2005

The Planning Board approved the Minutes of October 6, 2005 as submitted.

2. Signed bills.

3. Meetings and Hearings

7:00 P.M. Board Member Comments

- a) Mr. Rodolakis noted the passing of Robert Cole, a life-long town resident, and who was an attorney and also applicant of many projects in town, who appeared before the Board.
- b) Mr. Gordon noted there are five hearings for this meeting (and only because there are three continued hearings), and he suggested meeting twice in January (the regular meeting on the 5th and a second meeting on the 19th).

**7:05 P.M. Adams Farm Phase II, Senior Housing
Special Permit and Site Plan Approval
Public Hearing, Continued from October 6, 2005
Location: east side of Cherry Street, south of Boston Turnpike
Decision Deadline: 65 Days from the close of hearing**

Attending the hearing was James Tetreault – the engineer from Thompson & Liston Associates; and Attorney Marshall Gould – the attorney representing Brendon Properties; and Kevin Giblin – of Brendon Properties.

Attorney Gould listed the following details about the project:

- 1) described the location of the property and said it is just under 13 acres;
- 2) it is going to be a total of 17 duplexes, having two primary roads.
- 3) it's on the northeasterly side of Cherry Street and the southerly side of Route 9.
- 4) they will provide natural buffers to abutters, which are wetlands and wooded areas that are on the property.
- 5) there will be a total of 34 units, each, similar to Adams Farm I, having a two-car garage;
- 6) it is going to be a condominium form of ownership for 55-and over residents, so it's a senior residential community;
- 7) there will be additional clusters of approximately twelve guest parking spaces;
- 8) it will be on public water and sewer;
- 9) there will be some work done to the Cherry Street sewer pumping station.

Attorney Gould said they are seeking some waivers. He said they received a letter from Mr. Denoncourt that is three or four pages of comments, and said they are not prepared to deal with all of those now, so they would probably just give an overview, take questions, and ask for a continuance to the next meeting.

Mr. Tetreault said the property is 12.7 acres and they are proposing to alter approximately 70%. He said it has frontage on two public roads from Cherry Street and from Route 9, just to the west of the emergency access that services South Meadow Townhouses. He said the proposal is to use the access from Cherry Street, with an emergency access to Route 9.

Mr. Tetreault said the site would have 17 duplexes. He reviewed some of the site work showing the areas expected to be landscaped, left alone, and areas for detention basins.

Mr. Tetreault said they are asking for some waivers, and one is in regard to the width of the proposed roadway. He said the total proposed roadway is 740+/- on Drive A and 1240+/- on Drive B.

Mr. Tetreault said they will be filing with the Conservation Commission. He commented the project meets the Town's requirement for open space percentage and for area under the senior housing plan for the MF-1 zoning district.

Attorney Gould explained the property ownership, stating there are three entities that make-up the project site (three different owners), whereas Adams Farm I was just the one owner.

Mr. Giblin stated there is a landscape plan and lighting plan. He said with the receipt of the comment letter from Mr. Denoncourt, they will now schedule a meeting with Engineering, the abutters, and other Boards, before they come back to the Planning Board.

Mr. Naber asked what the proposed controls were for using and not using the emergency access road. Mr. Tetreault said he thought the expected controls were to use signage and not a gate, as requested by the Fire Chief.

Ms. Keohane said she would like to get their early thoughts on one of Mr. Denoncourt's comments regarding the cul-de-sac. Mr. Tetreault said they put the big turn-around in front of Building #9 in an effort, to what they thought was to comply with the Subdivision standards; but based on Mr. Denoncourt's Comment #13, they will take another look at it.

Ms. Keohane asked about Comment #17 regarding the pipe crossing. Mr. Tetreault said they show a roof drain from a building being set up to discharge to a proposed replication area, and stated that was the intention, to send a little more water to the replication area.

Mr. Gordon asked the following:

- 1) He asked what they were looking for in road width; Attorney Gould said between 22 feet in some locations and 24 feet in most others, and said that is one of the suggested waivers they are proposing. Mr. Gordon asked if that includes any sidewalk area. Attorney Gould said that it did not. Mr. Tetreault said the 22 feet is being proposed at the wetland crossing to minimize alteration of the wetland, and it is 24 feet everywhere else, and showed the proposed areas of the sidewalk.
- 2) He asked that they have the names for the streets when they come back.
- 3) He asked for the additional waivers they are asking for.
Attorney Gould said they are asking for:
 - a) a road centerline radius of 145 feet in two locations. Mr. Tetreault showed the locations of these.
 - b) the other is sidewalks on one side, similar to what was done on Adams Farm I, but making sure there is adequate handicap access with ramps at each home location.
- 4) He asked for sidewalk widths. Mr. Tetreault said five feet. He said on a related issue, one of the comments asked for a greater width on the grass plot, and they are going to make that change.
- 5) He asked if they would consider pursuing merging the emergency access with the emergency access of South Meadow, getting an easement from them to do it, so that there aren't two little roads for emergency so close together. Mr. Giblin said the reason they haven't met with South Meadow is because they are still in construction for the pump station and the landscaping they owe them. He commented he doesn't want to ask them for anything, but said it makes sense to get an easement from them to make a better project for him, and it doesn't do anything to hurt them. He said he's not ready to negotiate with them until he has everything lined up.

Helen McLaughlin, 37 Old Laxfield Road, asked what the distance was between the units. Mr. Tetreault said it varies, and listed some of the distances, and stated it meets the minimum 50-foot requirement.

Mrs. McLaughlin asked if there was going to be a clubhouse. Mr. Tetreault said right now there is no intention to build a clubhouse at this development.

Bill McLaughlin, 37 Old Laxfield Road, commented that some consideration should be given along with the other project (Ashford Crossing) that will be going on at the same time, to the effect it will have on South Meadow.

Christopher Kirk, 40 Westwood Road, asked if this project has an open space requirement. Mr. Tetreault said it does, and said this project has 72% open space.

Elsie Shippole, 63 Cherry Street, expressed concern for her quality of life during construction. She said with the pounding rocks in the roadway for almost a week, her house was shaking. She is concerned for the blasting, because of her wells, etc. Mr. Gordon explained the blasting procedures, if there is blasting.

Mr. Gordon asked Mr. Giblin if the Board could hear this at their January 19th meeting; and Mr. Giblin said that was fine and they would grant the extensions that were needed.

Mr. Gordon continued the hearing to January 19, 2006, at 7:05 P.M.

**7:10 P.M. Palm Meadow Estates, Definitive Subdivision
Public Hearing, Continued from July 7, 2005
Location: Clews Street, east of Route 140
Decision Deadline: February 28, 2006**

Mr. Gordon read a letter dated November 18, 2005, from John Parmentier, of Dunn-McKenzie, asking for a continuance, to the January meeting, and gave an extension for the Decision to February 28, 2006. The Board voted to allow the continuance as requested.

Mr. Gordon continued the hearing to January 19, 2006, at 7:10 P.M.

**7:15 P.M. Memorial Drive Business Park, Site Plan Approval
Public Hearing, Continued from August 4, 2005
Location: east side of Memorial Drive, south of Hyde Farm Road
Decision Deadline: 65 days from the close of hearing**

Mr. Gordon read a letter dated December 7, 2005, from RIFL Realty Trust, requesting a continuance of the hearing to the January meeting. The Board voted to allow the continuance as requested.

Mr. Gordon continued the hearing to January 5, 2006, at 7:15 P.M.

**7:20 P.M. Kings Brook Crossing, Definitive Subdivision
Public Hearing
Location: Old Mill Road, northwest of Harrington Avenue
Decision Deadline: January 10, 2006**

Attending the hearing were Mike and Jim Venincasa – the developers from Northeast Financial Management Corporation, Attorney Joseph Allen – the attorney representing the developer, and Peter O'Connell – the engineer from Protec Engineering.

Mr. Gordon read the letter from the Fire Chief. Mr. Gordon noted they needed information for the Certificate of Ownership, Certificate of Municipal Liens, and Locus plan. Attorney Allen gave the extension to February 28, 2006. He said this is approximately a five acre site.

Attorney Allen said they are proposing to build 7 duplex townhouse style lots (total of 14 units), and they will be side by side, with two bedrooms and 2-1/2 baths. He said they feel this project will assist in addressing a need for more affordable housing.

Attorney Allen said the preliminary plan was approved on July 7, 2005, and they are asking for the following waivers:

- 1) paving reduced to 24 feet;
- 2) right-of-way reduced from 50 to 40 feet, but noted the Board didn't think that was something they wanted to do.
- 3) they're asking to have the cul-de-sac radius reduced to 90 feet;
- 4) a granite curb waiver;
- 5) sidewalk on one side of the roadway;
- 6) because these will be two-family houses, they need two driveways per lot, which is not permitted under the Planning Board's Rules and Regulations.

Attorney Allen said they did submit a traffic survey, and said the consultant found that Old Mill Road is a very heavily traveled road, but it is able to accommodate the traffic on it. He reviewed the report, and said it would be a Level A or B during the peak hour of the morning and in the evening would be a Level C.

Attorney Allen said from previous meetings, there are two issues with the neighbors. He said Mr. Barton is the abutter to the northwest and Ms. Kelley is the abutter to the northeast, and they both have a gravel driveway. He said they've had their surveyor look at that and they feel that the driveway encroaches upon their property, but it is not their intention to deny anybody access to their own property. He said they are proposing to either give easements to them to maintain their driveways as they are, or if they preferred, they could give access directly to their roadway and give them a much safer access out onto Old Mill Road.

Mr. O'Connell said they are proposing a road 594 feet to the center of the cul-de-sac. He said they are proposing a cross country gravity sewer. He said he is still reviewing and addressing the comments from Mr. Denoncourt, and commented they can address all of them; they can all be done.

Mr. O'Connell reviewed the waiver requests.

Mr. Naber said the one area of concern would be the traffic flow, and commented having the traffic study is important.

Ms. Keohane asked about Mr. Denoncourt's comment regarding relocating the detention pond. Mr. O'Connell said the plan that he is showing does represent some of the changes they have made recently, and he showed the placement of the detention pond.

Ms. Myers asked what their thought was about Mr. Denoncourt's comment to reduce the number of lots from 7 to 6. Attorney Allen expressed concern about the request that the number of lots be reduced. He said there was a Town Meeting and a lot of emphasis on affordable housing was expressed. He said these are duplex units, these are the bottom of the price range; he didn't understand why the Board would request to get rid of two of them. He said he felt this was the kind of thing that's needed in Town. Ms. Myers asked if they were deed restricted affordable. Attorney Allen said they are not affordable in the sense of '40B'; they are just modestly priced houses.

Mr. Gordon asked if these will be sprinklered. Attorney Allen said he didn't think it was required for two; he thought four was the threshold. Mr. Gordon said they might want to consider it while the buildings are just being built to put it in now.

Mr. Gordon asked if they provided minimal access to Greylock Avenue. Attorney Allen said their plan shows a walkway for Greylock Avenue. He said there was a suggestion that a post or something be put in there so an ATV can't go through.

Lee Bettencourt, 31 Greylock Avenue, asked if water could be hooked in to Old Mill instead of Greylock Avenue. Mr. O'Connell said the water is being looped between Old Mill Road and Greylock Avenue. Mr. Gordon explained it is being looped so that the water doesn't get stagnant at a dead end.

Larry Barton, 35 Greylock Avenue, asked for clarification on the strip of Lot #7. He expressed concern for the strip belonging to a homeowner who is far away; who is going to cut the grass on it, who's going to pick up the trash on that, etc. Mr. O'Connell said this will be included in a Condo Agreement and Bylaws.

Mr. Gordon said they haven't seen anything on this yet, and they will comment on it when the Board sees it.

Attorney Allen restated that they will provide access to the abutting land through an easement, and restated the options.

Sharon Shadbegian, 120 Old Mill Road, expressed concern about maintaining the aesthetic value, as she will be facing the project. Mr. O'Connell explained the landscaping, and suggested driving through some of the projects they have done. Mr. Gordon asked Attorney Allen if they would provide a drawing of what the front and back yards might look like. Attorney Allen said they would. Ms. Shadbegian also expressed concern for the increased traffic.

Archie Shadbegian, 120 Old Mill Road, also expressed concern for increased traffic, and asked if there will be street lights on the new road, and if it was going to be underground wiring. Mr. O'Connell said all the utilities will be underground. Mr. Shadbegian also asked if the sidewalk was going to be concrete with concrete curbing. Mr. O'Connell said yes. Mr. Gordon clarified that the sidewalk will be bituminous.

Debra Kelley, 126 Old Mill Road, discussed access to her property, also expressed concern for the activity on that part of Old Mill Road, with the fishing at the pond, turtles crossing the road, people walking, stating it's not the same normal street and activity for an intersection. Mr. Gordon suggested that the developers and engineer meet with the two abutters and let them know what the plans are.

Mr. Gordon asked if there were developments similar to the ones being proposed to be looked at. Mike Venincasa said this was a new design for them. Mr. Gordon said it would be helpful if they could provide elevations and rendering of what they might look like at the next meeting.

The Board voted to allow continuance to January 19, 2006. Mr. Gordon continued the hearing to January 19, 2006, at 7:15 P.M.

7:35 P.M. Nelson Point, Definitive Subdivision
Public Hearing
Location: off Nelson Point Road, west of Lake Street
Decision Deadline: February 2, 2006

Attending the hearing were Chris Cutler and Attorney David Brown – the developers, and John Bensley – the engineer from Beals and Thomas, Inc.

Mr. Gordon read the following letters into the record:

- 1) Fire Chief, dated November 28, 2005
- 2) Police Chief, dated November 22, 2005
- 3) Highway Superintendent, dated November 17, 2005
- 4) Board of Health, dated November 29, 2005
- 5) E-Mail correspondence from Ruth Flynn and neighbors, dated November 30, 2005

Attorney Brown said they are proposing to make improvements to Nelson Point Road, which is a graveled private road; they are proposing to make it a 20-foot wide paved surface, proposing to level out the significant dip in the road, and proposing a sidewalk on one side of that road.

Attorney Brown submitted a copy of the preliminary plan to the Board for comparison. He said in the preliminary plan there was quite a bit of concern expressed about the end of the cul-de-sac, and the fact that a lot of the houses might be built behind the abutters and there might be a very tight configuration. He said they did eliminate a couple of lots in that area, to hopefully eliminate that concern.

Attorney Brown said the other large shaped lot on the preliminary plan was eliminated. He said the other major change was there were three 50-foot backland lots, and those have been eliminated, and now three straight conventional lots are proposed there. He said they reduced the number of lots overall from 21 to 18, and that includes the existing home.

Mr. Bensley said this site is 19.7 acres in total land area. He said they will be going to the Conservation Commission. He said there are 18 proposed lots; there are five frontage lots on Nelson Point Road, and said these will all be single family lots complying with zoning. He said there are 12 two-family lots that comply with zoning. He commented that some are rear lots and some are conventional.

Mr. Bensley said the proposed roadway, Point Road, is about 560 feet long; there are sidewalks on both sides of the roadway; and the pavement is 24 feet. He said they intend to extend the water down, to the end of the cul-de-sac, with hydrants along the way. He commented that electric, cable, telephone, etc., will all be underground from the existing overhead wires that are on Nelson Point Road.

Mr. Bensley said regarding sewer, there's a low pressure common force main sewer that runs up Nelson Point Road and ties in by gravity at Lake Street into the town sewer system. He said they are proposing to connect the five single family house lots that front on Nelson Point Road into that sewer. He said the other lots will be sub-surface sewage disposal systems.

Mr. Bensley said they had designed an extensive drainage system in the cul-de-sac, and he reviewed the system, and said the system they designed will meet D.E.P.'s Stormwater Management Policy for peak grades, recharge, and water quality.

Mr. Bensley said they are proposing to realign Nelson Point Road within the right-of-way, which will bring the intersection closer to the Lake Street intersection, so it will be closer to a four-way intersection. He said they are proposing to do some vegetation trimming at the intersection; just cutting low hanging branches and shrubs; not cutting trees, to improve sight distance.

Mr. Bensley noted that there will be fill at the flood plain and a little bit of the wetlands, they are proposing some compensatory wetland creation in an area that is currently upland.

Mr. Bensley reviewed the traffic report, which was submitted to the Board.

Ms. Keohane asked why they decided to use septic and not go for a Phase I waiver. Mr. Bensley said on the preliminary plan, a comment came that they ought to do septic on this site for some of the lots. Attorney Brown added that the perc grades were excellent in that area.

Ms. Keohane said for the duplex units, it looks like there is a shared leaching field. Mr. Bensley said there will be two separate tanks and one distribution box. Ms. Keohane asked how they will be maintained. Attorney Brown said there will be a homeowner's association for certain common areas; within each unit they will set up a condominium association to maintain the leaching field.

Ms. Keohane commented:

- 1) that she thought that it was heavier on duplexes than she thought they were going to get.
- 2) noted the phosphorous problem at the Mass. Military Reservation at Cape Cod, and commented that maybe their report should be looked at again for septic systems;
- 3) expressed concern for the TMDL rate for the units;
- 4) commented on 'circles' not in right place and maybe getting lawn areas on some of these units; Mr. Bensley said they did provide an exhibit plan showing a concept for how the houses and duplexes would be, but it is not in the Board's set of plans; he said the lots are designed within the zoning.
- 5) on the septic systems, asked if some of them were going to be mounded or just raised up a little (for instance Lot #13 – looks like 2 feet)? Mr. Bensley said they haven't done definitive on this, but it could be mounded some.
- 6) on the detention ponds, they are asking for a waiver of the gravel road around it, and asked why; Mr. Bensley said they are just trying to limit the amount of work around these basins. He said these basins are very shallow, and said they've got good soil that allows alot of percolation (only 1-1/2 foot deep). He said if it needs maintenance, a soft tire back-hoe could go back there and maybe a small dump truck. Ms. Keohane asked Mr. Denoncourt if the Town had a soft tire backhoe. He said he thinks the town does, but he thinks what might needs to be discussed is the staffing in the Highway Department to maintain these basins. He said specific design of the basin will have to be looked at and how it will be maintained.
- 7) asked where the second vortech unit was; Mr. Bensley showed.
- 8) on the walking path – will it be deeded? Mr. Bensley said it is an access easement. Attorney Brown said the plan is to have a deeded access for abutters and public to use.
- 9) discussion about the 2% street grade from the gutter line; Mr. Bensley said the plan shows the vertical curb starting right at the gutter line with a 4% grade coming out of it. He explained further. Attorney Brown said it is designed this way to try and minimize the blasting.
- 10) noted that they need to talk to Engineering and/or Highway about the retaining wall.

Mr. Naber asked if they have looked at and considered any Chapter 40B. Attorney Brown said they were not planning on it, and felt that having the duplex units makes them more affordable for town.

Mr. Rodolakis asked what the proposed pavement was for Nelson Point Road. Mr. Bensley said 20 feet on Nelson Point Road. Mr. Rodolakis asked if they felt the 20-foot pavement provided adequate access for this subdivision. Mr. Bensley said yes he did. Attorney Brown said that also there is a sidewalk on one side.

Mr. Rodolakis asked if a traffic study took into account whether the 20-foot pavement would be adequate to service Point Road and the ANR lots on Nelson Point Road. Mr. Bensley said he didn't think the width of pavement was an issue there in terms of traffic flow. He said it's not a traffic flow question as much as it was for emergency vehicles able to pass each other. Mr. Rodolakis said he thinks one of the things that have to be demonstrated to the Board in conjunction with the Point Road Subdivision, is that Nelson Point Road provides adequate access. Attorney Brown said they will come back with more information.

Mr. Rodolakis said he had asked for back-up that the lots on Point Road do have actually access over Nelson Point Road. Attorney Brown said he will provide a letter and/or back-up for this.

Mr. Gordon asked the following:

- 1) what is the intention for Lot A? Attorney Brown said Lot A is a buildable lot and probably will be built on at some point. Mr. Gordon commented that he questions if it is a buildable lot.
- 2) asked if they have looked into alternatives on their road into Lake Street moving it away from the wetland; Mr. Bensley said it is away from the wetland right now in its current location. He said what they were looking to do is move it into its right-of-way. After some discussion, Mr. Gordon said he's not looking for them to eliminate a lot; he's looking for, what he would consider, a better access to South Quinsigamond with a 2% landing area for 50 feet. He said he'd like them to look at it.
- 3) since Nelson Point Road is a private road and the subdivision is going to come off a private road, shouldn't they be considering the whole distance – rather than just the 560 feet? Attorney Brown said his interpretation is they are proposing a 560-foot cul-de-sac. Mr. Gordon commented that could be a problem, but they can talk to Engineering.
- 4) regarding the cul-de-sac, asked if they had considered swinging the cul-de-sac so that some of those lots would not have such a narrow frontage in terms of the rear lots; Mr. Bensley said the reason they have the cul-de-sac where they have it is because they are confined by the wetlands on the two sides of the road. Mr. Gordon suggested that they talk to Engineering about possibly moving the cul-de-sac.
- 5) On Sheet EX-1, he said he doesn't see any driveways and he said he sees that one of the single family's does not have a garage; Mr. Bensley said the garage is underneath. Mr. Gordon said he would like to see driveways on these and elevations of the driveways.
- 6) Mr. Gordon asked them to explain the blasting procedure, in case they have to blast.
- 7) expressed concern about the cutting being proposed to give them the 325 feet for site distance. He asked who would maintain the area that is cut back. Mr. Bensley said it probably would require periodic maintenance. Mr. Gordon asked who will be responsible for that? Mr. Bensley said he can't say; it's a public way. Mr. Gordon commented that this is something that has to be pursued.
- 8) he asked where the betterment of Nelson Point Road would stop? Mr. Bensley said betterment is proposed to stop as shown, at the end of the pavement section. Mr. Gordon said this would be on the existing road. Mr. Bensley said that was right.
- 9) he said he visited this road the day before this meeting at around 4:00. He said he noticed that it was close to a 'D' or an 'F' intersection at that time of day for traffic flow. He asked when their traffic study was done. Mr. Bensley said he can't recall the date of study, but it extended over a 24-hour period. Mr. Gordon asked for that information.
- 10) he, as a member of the Lake Quinsigamond Commission, he does have concerns about them accessing the lake from their property and asked where they would be accessing it.
Mr. Bensley said he's not sure that they are actually proposing access, but explained that there is a pedestrian walking path with an access easement, and that easement that's open to the public extends all the way back along back of the lots. He said he didn't think there was any intent in putting a boat landing back there; it was really for public's walking enjoyment.
- 11) he asked where, in relation to the high tension wires, is the walking path.
Mr. Bensley showed the proposed path area and said most of it will be reviewed with the Conservation Commission. He said they will also put benches. Mr. Gordon asked who will maintain the benches. Attorney Brown said they will be granite. Mr. Gordon commented benches will get broken. Attorney Brown said maintenance could be put in the homeowners' association agreement, if the Board wanted.
- 12) he said that they should have discussion with Engineering to convince them that they don't need a ten-foot area around the detention basins. Mr. Bensley said he was going to try to. Mr. Gordon asked if they don't, would they put them? Mr. Bensley said they certainly can do that.

There was further discussion about building the subdivision off a private road and right of access. Attorney Brown said it was his intention to make Nelson Point Road public.

Mr. Rodolakis commented they may have to go to Town Meeting to obtain some kind of a release to work in the street. He felt this should be a condition for approval – that Attorney Brown works to obtaining acceptance of Nelson Point Road, and Point Road couldn't be accepted as a public way until then.

Mr. Rodolakis asked if they realign Nelson Point Road to the south, would they go for Lot A to be grandfathered as a buildable lot, as there could be some lost area. Attorney Brown said it would be a buildable lot without grandfathering.

Lillian Marshall, 422 South Quinsigamond Avenue, expressed concern for the septic systems.

Kevin Thibodeau, 27 Nelson Point Road, also expressed concern about the installation of septic systems. He asked about bringing the water down further, and if pavement would be brought down further. Mr. Gordon stated this was being looked at.

Dottie Flynn, 9 Nelson Point Road, expressed the following:

- 1) concern for traffic flow at Nelson Point Road.
- 2) asked about house placement and expressed concern that the area would be clear cut. Attorney Brown said they would not be clear cutting.
- 3) expressed concern for the whole Point Road being duplexes, and the increase of children at Coolidge School.
- 4) talked to the Highway Superintendent about putting some kind of signage before the development is begun, for people to get an idea that there is a road coming out.
- 5) expressed concern for the sidewalk being on her side of the street.

Dan White, 556 Lake Street, said Lot A has been before the Town before, and it has been refused for construction because of the surface area.

Rick Bousquet, 29 Nelson Point Road, is still concerned about the amount of homes; thinks it's total maximization.

Ms. Keohane asked for a construction sequencing plan for the next hearing.

Attorney Brown signed the letter of extension to February 15, 2006. The Board voted to allow continuance to January 19, 2006. Mr. Gordon continued the hearing to January 19, 2006, at 7:20 P.M.

**7:50 P.M. Gulf View Estates, Definitive Subdivision
Public Hearing
Location: Gulf Street & Browning Road
Decision Deadline: February 13, 2006**

The Board expressed concern that no abutters were in attendance and if there was notification. The engineer for the developer said they were sent, but the 'green cards' were left at his office. Attorney Allen, representing the developer, said they will be continuing this hearing anyway, and agreed to give an informal overview of the project.

Mr. Gordon read the following correspondence into the record:

- 1) Fire Chief, dated November 29, 2005
- 2) Highway Superintendent, dated November 28, 2005
- 3) Police Chief, dated November 28, 2005

Attending the hearing was Attorney Joseph Allen – representing the developer. He said this is a definitive plan, and noted that this is the first definitive plan that will be subject to the Board's new inclusionary by-law. He said they haven't figured out, at this point, how it's going to impact what they are doing.

Attorney Allen said they received Mr. Denoncourt's comment letter and there are a number of issues that they can work out with him on an engineer to engineer basis. He introduced Tony Hossein (Hossein Haghazadhbh) and Josh Reinke – engineers from HS&T Group, Inc.

Mr. Gordon asked that when they appear for the continued hearing that they respond to Mr. Denoncourt's letter of November 16, 2005, asking for information and items.

Mr. Hossein said he was told that the traffic report, which was done by the Blair project, actually included these 23 lots. He said the impact analysis is being done by Eco Tech.

Mr. Hossein said one of the main issues was the location of the cul-de-sac. He said the developer is willing to take under consideration eliminating the cul-de-sac. He said they will discuss with Engineering Mr. Denoncourt's comment for some improvement to the intersection near Browning Road.

Mr. Hossein said they hired a consultant to look at the Hill Street Pump Station, and they know what the problems are and what the improvements are, and said they are willing to take care of those. He said there is an agreement in place between Blair Builders and Leading Edge, that the cost of the improvements will be shared with Blair Builders. He said they can supply a copy of the agreement to the Board.

Mr. Hossein said the other issue is the three-foot detention pond. He said if they are going to have to provide a 10-foot access road around it, they will need to build some kind of retaining wall to be able to provide the 10 feet there. He said maybe they can come up with some alternative in talking to Engineering. He commented that eliminating the cul-de-sac will reduce the amount of pavement area, which will reduce the amount of impervious area and also reduces the size of the detention pond, so maybe something can be done.

Mr. Hossein said they can address all the other comments of Mr. Denoncourt's letter.

The Board voted to allow continuance to January 19, 2006. Mr. Gordon continued the hearing to January 19, 2006, at 7:25 P.M.

8:05 P.M. Glendale Avenue, Definitive Subdivision
Public Hearing
Location: Clinton Street (Rte. 70) @ Boylston Town Line
Decision Deadline: February 14, 2006

Mr. Gordon read a letter dated December 7, 2005, from TLA, Inc., requesting a continuance of the hearing to the January meeting. The Board voted to allow the continuance as requested.

Mr. Gordon continued the hearing to January 19, 2006, at 7:15 P.M.

4. New Business

a. Bond Reduction for Dorothea Estates, Shrewsbury Hunt, and Noble Oak Estates

The Board voted the bond reduction amounts for Dorothea Estates, Shrewsbury Hunt, and Noble Oak Estates, as prepared and approved by Engineering.

b. Bond Reduction for Saxon Woods 76 and Saxon Woods 98

The Board voted the bond reduction for Saxon Woods 76 and Saxon Woods 98, as prepared and approved by Engineering.

5. Old Business

a. Sign Subdivision Control Agreement for Hickory Hill Estates

The Board voted to accept the Subdivision Control Agreement, and allow Mr. Gordon to sign.

b. Finalize 2006 Meeting Schedule

The Board accepted the 2006 meeting schedule as listed, voting on the June and July dates as follows:

June 8, 2006 (with a filing deadline of May 17, 2006)

July 13, 2006 (with a filing deadline of June 21, 2006)

6. Correspondence

The Board noted the following correspondence:

- a) Article in Worcester Business Journal entitled, "Home sweet mall."
- b) Letter dated December 5, 2005, from Attorney General's Office, regarding Article 10, from October 2005 Special Town Meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

Annette W. Rebovich